## REMARKS

Applicant has filed the present Response and Amendment in reply to the outstanding Official Action of December 28, 2005, and Applicant believes the Response and Amendment to be fully responsive to the Final Official Action for the reasons set forth below in greater detail.

At the onset, Applicant would like to note that Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 16, and 25-27 have been amended herewith. Claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 10 have been amended to delete the "means plus function" language. Instead the amended claims recite "configured to" language. Applicant submits that the subject matter of the amended claims is patentable.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 16 and 25-27 have allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the rejected base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Claims 16 and 25 have been amended into independent form including all of the limitations of the rejected base claims and all intervening claims. Applicant submits that the aforementioned amendment obviates the Examiner's objections.

Applicant further notes that Claims 26 and 27 have been amended for clarification.

Applicant further notes that new Claims 33-39 have been respectfully submitted for examination. Independent Claim 33 is directed to a mobile phone with at least one main clock comprising, *inter alia*, a controller configured to stop and restart said generation of said main clock signal, and to reload a value to said main counter prior to restarting said generation of said main clock signal, wherein said value is calculated according to both the time period which said generation of said main clock is stopped and said frequency ratio between said main clock signal and said wait clock signal. Claims 34-39 depend, whether directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 33. Lastly, Applicant notes that Claims 11-15, 17-24 and 28-32 have been

cancelled herewith. The cancellation of these claims is without any prejudice to the subject matter of these claims being reintroduced into a later filed related application.

No new matter has been added by the aforementioned amendments and new claims. For example, support therefor can be found at pages 11, 16-19 and 21.

Applicant submits that Claims 1-4, 6-10, 16, 25-27 and 33-39 are patentable. Firstly, Applicant notes that in the outstanding Official Action the Examiner indicated that Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are allowed. The aforementioned amendments to these claims should not change the allowance.

Secondly, the Examiner indicated that Claims 16 and 25-27 were objected to. The aforementioned amendments obviate the objection. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Thirdly, Applicant submits that the new claims are patentably distinct from Kohlschmidt, the primary reference cited in the Official Action. Specifically, Applicant submits that the reference fails to teach, suggest or disclose "a controller configured to stop and restart said generation of said main clock signal, and to reload a value to said main counter prior to restarting said generation of said main clock signal, wherein said **value is calculated according to both the time period which said generation of said main clock is stopped and said frequency ratio between said main clock signal and said wait clock signal**", as recited in Claim 33.

The prior art reference does not calculate the ratio of the frequencies. In contrast, it uses a complex calibration process during a predetermined calibration period to account for a difference.

During the calibration, a timing relationship is calculated by measuring the clock cycles of each clock source for a given calculation time interval, and this timing relationship is used to adjust the high accuracy clock.

Specifically, prior to entering the sleep mode, a calibration timer is set with a predetermined value representing a calibration time period, which will be used to calibrate the slow clock to the high accuracy clock. During this period, a timing relationship between the slow clock and the high accuracy clock is measured. See Col. 6, lines 28-54. **A register is used to accumulate a number of cycles from the high accuracy clock according to the cycles from the slow clock. A formula is then used to calculate the relationship.** See Col. 6, lines 60-65.

The claimed invention simply calculates the frequency ratio and does not require the above calibration process or period. Therefore, the reference fails to teach each and every aspect of the claims. Moreover, Applicant submits that Romao, United States Patent No. 6,650,189 fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies. While Romao appears to disclose a main clock and a wait clock with two different frequencies, the reference does not suggest calculating a ratio of the frequencies and to use this calculated value to calibrate the main clock.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Claim 33 is patentable.

Applicant further submits that Claims 34-39 are patentable at least based upon their dependency, whether directly or indirectly, from Claim 33.

Applicant submits that dependent Claims 34, 35, 38 and 39 are separately patentable. Specifically, none of the cited references teach a temperature sensor (Claim 34) or battery (Claim 35) wherein the precision measuring unit calculates the frequency ratio when the sensor detects a

change; limitations that are recited in Claims 34 and 35, respectively. Furthermore, none of the cited references teach two main clocks, as recited in Claims 38 and 39.

Accordingly, Claims 34, 35, 38 and 39 are separately patentable.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claims 11-15, 17-24, and 28-32. Additionally, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objections to Claims 16, 25-27. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow new Claims 33-39.

In conclusion, the Applicant believes that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and henceforth respectfully solicits the Examiner to allow the application. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite the allowance of this application, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

Seth Weinfeld
Registration No: 50,929

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
516-742-4343
SW:ae